REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31 have been amended. The application continues to include claims 1-9 and 21-31.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with the Applicants' representative on August 18, 2009. The substance of the interview is reflected in this Amendment. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

The Claims are Allowable because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose Using an Accumulated Reversing Delta to Reconstruct a Previously Enforced Security Policy

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,202,157 ("Brownlie") in view of Donohue, U.S. Patent No. 6,199,204 and further in view of Chamberlain, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,749, or in alternative, further in view of De Meno et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0029517 ("De Meno"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue and Chamberlain, or in alternative, De Meno and further in view of Wang, U.S. Pat. No. 5,956,521. Claims 3, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Donohue and Chamberlain, or in alternative, De Meno and further in view of Trcka et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0039579 ("Trcka") and Microsoft *Press, Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition* (1997). Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully

requested because the prior art fails to disclose using an accumulated reversing delta to reconstruct a previously enforced security policy.

One embodiment of the present invention is a system 100 for maintaining security in a distributed computing environment. The system includes a policy manager 112 coupled to a network 114 with a database 218 for storing a security policy that includes a plurality of rules that control user access to applications. *See e.g.*, ¶ [0046]; Figs. 1 and 2. The system further includes a security engine 310 located on a client coupled to the network which stores a set of rules constituting a local customized security policy received through the network and enforces the local customized security policy with respect to an application at the client. *See e.g.*, ¶ [0074]. The security policy is updated by recording a series of incremental changes to the security policy, determining which of the incremental changes are applicable to the security engine, computing an accumulated delta that reflects the series of incremental changes applicable to the security engine and sending the accumulated delta to the security engine from the policy manager so that the security engine uses the accumulated delta to update the local customized security policy. *See e.g.*, ¶ [0094]. A previously enforced version of the local customized security policy is reconstructed by generating an accumulated reversing delta at the policy manager and sending the accumulated reversing delta to the security engine, the accumulated reversing delta comprises a sequence of incremental changes in a reverse order. *See e.g.*, ¶ [0106]. Therefore, a security policy can be easily rolled back and network congestion time and distribution time is reduced.

None of the prior art discloses a similar method of rolling back to a previous security policy. For example, Chamberlain discloses a method for restoring a computer to its original state after an unsuccessful patch installation attempt. Chamberlain discloses that an installer program module can create one or more "inverse records" or "patch rollback script records". *See* Chamberlain at col. 11, ll. 33-40. The patch rollback script record "typically includes instructions on how to delete the installed patch installation data of the patch installation script record". *See* Chamberlain at col. 11, l. 67 - col. 12, l. 3. Therefore, Chamberlain fails to disclose an accumulating reverse delta that is merely a sequence of incremental changes in a reverse order rather than specific instructions for deletion. Further, Chamberlain is directed to software patching rather than the distribution of security policies.

In contrast to the cited prior art, amended independent claim 1 recites "generating an accumulated reversing delta at the policy manager and sending the accumulated reversing delta to the security engine, wherein the accumulated reversing delta comprises a sequence of incremental changes in a reverse order". For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1, and amended independent claims 7, 21, 26, 30 and 31, which recite similar limitations, should now be allowable over the cited prior art. The remaining claims depend from one of the above independent claims and should also be allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully requests favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

A one month extension of time fee is required for this submission. Should any other fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

<div align="center">

Respectfully submitted,

</div>

Date: <u>August 20, 2009</u>   /Barry S. Goldsmith/
                                        Barry S. Goldsmith
                                        Attorney for Applicants
                                        Registration No. 39,690

Customer No. 74739
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7876
Fax: 703-720-7802

BSG:sjm